



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

P. 111.—The numerals from 70 to 120 'sind unerklärt.' Some of them are difficult indeed ; but it might safely be said, that *hund* and Gothic *tēhund* are nothing but varieties of the form used as ordinal in Gothic *taihund-a*, etc., 'the tenth,' 'a decade,' *hund* representing a shortened \**dkmtóm*, and *tēhund* being derived from a lengthened \**dēkm*; *tēhund* retained, like *taihunda*, its old meaning, thence *taihuntēhund*, like Old Norse *tio tiger* = ten decades = a 'hundred,' while the more isolated form *hund* developed also the specific meaning 'the tenth number ten,' = ten decades = a hundred, and in the combination *pusundi* = \**tūs-kmtjē* = the 'large hundred' it even came to serve for a 'thousand.' In Old English, *hundseofontiz*, etc., the *-tiz* was added, when the meaning of *hund* had become obscured ; the *-ant* of Old Saxon *antsibunta* is a remnant of *hund*, developed as a pretonic syllable before voiceless *s*, while the ending *-ta*, OHG. *-zo* in *sibunzo* is a shortening of *-tah*, *-zuh*, the vowels as well as the *h* and *g* (tigus) alternating according to accent, and the *h*, of *-tah*, *-zoh* disappearing before vowels.

P. 113.—For 'wenig' (isolierte Reste) read 'wenige.'

P. 127.—The elaborate attempt again to explain the preterit forms ON. *hét*, *lét*, *fekk*, etc., on the basis of original reduplication does not seem to me satisfactory ; since the author found it impossible to account for the Norse and Westgermanic vowels by *ablaut*, a frank statement that the question is not yet completely solved would have been in place in a work of this kind.

P. 143.—In the preterit participle of the strong verbs the *a*-Umlaut of *i* has, after all, had its way in Icelandic *beðenn*.

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,  
EVANSTON, ILL.

---

*Shakespeare and Voltaire.* By Thomas R. Lounsbury. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.

This book is part of a master-work on Shakespeare, the first volume of which—*Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*—appeared in 1901. According to Professor Lounsbury there existed, in the sixteenth as well as the nineteenth centuries, two forms of art, which may, for

convenience' sake, be called romanticism and classicism. When Shakespeare deliberately chose the former, he not only insured its success in his own time, but saved England from entirely falling under the bane of the latter, when French influence became most powerful. The great modern critics, such as Schlegel and Coleridge, who pleaded the cause of romanticism, did not effect a revolution, but vindicated one long effected, and lent the additional weight of right reason to a victory mainly won by instinct. Such is the general idea or thesis that gives the various parts of Professor Lounsbury's work clearness and cohesion.

The present book deals with only an incident in the long war waged between the two rival conceptions of art—with an important one, however, since the future of European literature hung upon its issue. The struggle between Voltaire and Shakespeare bore in letters the significance that the struggle between Louis XIV and William of Orange had borne in politics. Once more did England stand up as the champion of liberty, while France threw in her lot with arbitrary power; Shakespeare was contending for the rights of the individual imagination, Voltaire doing battle in the interest of fixed and traditional rules; to their mutual opponents the Frenchman appeared a reactionary, and the Englishman an anarchist. Of course the argument runs counter to the generally received opinion that Voltaire, having discovered Shakespeare, admired his plays, trumpeted his fame abroad, and borrowed from him hints for his own plays; but, seeing others go beyond his timid innovations, and fearing that the French drama might suffer in consequence, he attacked Shakespeare with a violence excusable only because resorted to in self-defense, and pulled down the idol that he had set up. For Professor Lounsbury, Voltaire's attitude is suspicious throughout. His opinion was in substance the same, whether embodied in the *Lettres Anglaises* or the *Letter to the Academy*: 'Voltaire's attitude toward Shakespeare and the English stage never really varied in its character from first to last (p. 138). As he advanced in years, his enmity steadily increased, and his disparagement became more frequent and pronounced. His change of attitude was not due at all to any change in his opinions' (p. 178). Voltaire reminds his readers of Louis XIV cajoling Charles II, the better to dupe and enslave him. His dealings are often downright dishonest, he misstates scenes in the plays, garbles his translations,

and displays an ignorance of the English language and the text of Shakespeare calculated to show the English dramatist in the worst possible light : "He deliberately misrepresented blank verse to those who knew nothing of its character (p. 225). He took at times studied care to lower the character of Shakespeare's language (p. 227). The misrepresentation was deliberate (p. 230). It is not always easy to decide whether his mistranslations are due to ignorance or intention' (p. 285).

To this severe indictment Voltaire might, perhaps not without good reason, plead not guilty. It is inconceivable, unless one admits a singular flaw of character, that Voltaire should have displayed such consummate duplicity in Shakespeare's case. Not that his subtle genius precluded an occasional use of intrigue. But Shakespeare seemed an unimportant opponent, at least for many years. Even with the *Letter to the Academy* thrown in, Voltaire's writings on Shakespeare do not amount to the twentieth part of his whole work. Professor Lounsbury says himself that the English stage was but a small preoccupation for a man unceasingly fighting the noble battle of freedom of thought. Voltaire was probably at first amused by Shakespeare. Anything strange and new attracted him. He spoke of him with careless praise, as the fitting poet for a people bold enough to depose or behead their kings.

Then the excuse for inaccurate translation is to be found in the chapter in which Professor Lounsbury shows us how little Voltaire knew English history. His had been no scientific, but a purely literary, training. In one sense, there was never a more perfect pupil of the Jesuits; he was able to write, in verse or prose, in an entertaining manner, on any conceivable subject. He could compose a novel or a tragedy, dash off a tale, review a book; but he was unable to collate a text, or ascertain a date. It is possible that when fairly roused against Shakespeare, he twisted the meaning of a line or two, though his knowledge of English must then have been very small; but what would in a modern scholar be unpardonable baseness, deserves in Voltaire to be dealt with only as a venial sin. As to his calling Lord Kames "Lord Makaimes," the blunder is perhaps intentional, since the name conveyed to Frenchmen an unmistakable idea of Scottish extraction.

The relation between Voltaire and England has often been discussed, but Professor Lounsbury puts the question in a new light

by studying England's attitude towards Voltaire; and giving a minute account of these forgotten English criticisms, he has written a valuable contribution to literary history. Voltaire's works were at first kindly received; then his attacks—in the prefaces to *Mérope* and *Sémiramis*—roused resentment. We observe that Voltaire's opponents were mostly obscure men; great critics like Johnson, when urged to take arms in Shakespeare's cause, declined to do so; the resentment, moreover, did not endure long: to the *Letter to the Academy* the English showed indifference. The reason was that the contest, as far as it interested England, had been decided in favor of Shakespeare; perhaps was it also because the English in the eighteenth century did not care much for literary disputes.

In conclusion, Professor Lounsbury regrets that Voltaire retarded on the Continent a due appreciation of Shakespeare. It seems hardly probable that Voltaire, had his authority, great as it was, been used in the interest of Shakespeare, could have altered his countrymen's taste. Even to-day, in spite of the romanticists, Voltaire's appreciation remains that of most Frenchmen: "an inspired barbarian" they call the English poet, some laying stress on the adjective, but the greater number on the noun.

A careful regard for composition and style enhances the value of a book which, though containing some points open to dispute, offers an undeniable interest. Students of comparative literature will especially be thankful to Professor Lounsbury for the chapters on the attitude taken towards Voltaire by the English.<sup>1</sup>

CH. BASTIDE.

---

*Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors.* By John Garrett Underhill. New York: Published for the Columbia University Press by The Macmillan Company, 1899. Pp. x, 438.

This book, the object of which is 'to determine, within certain limits, the place which the literature of Spain and Portugal occupied

<sup>1</sup> The word *costume* (custom), p. 232, was, according to Littré, introduced into French from the Italian in the time of Louis XIII. With reference to Voltaire it could hardly be called a 'recent' word.